DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 054 SP 035 401

AUTHOR Sclan, Eileen Mary
TITLE Performance Evaluation for Experienced Teachers: An Overview of State Policies. Trends and Issues Paper, No. 10.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89333-123-6
PUB DATE Jul 94
CONTRACT RR930020115
NOTE 77p.; For a related document, see ED 341 689.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186 ($14.50 prepaid, includes shipping and handling).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Clearinghouse Products (071) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Holistic Evaluation; *Performance Factors; *Policy Formation; *State Standards; State Surveys; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teaching Experience; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Experienced Teachers

ABSTRACT

This paper examines recent trends in the establishment of state-level policies for the performance evaluation of experienced teachers. "Trends" are defined as the prevailing state-sanctioned currents of thinking that undergird teacher performance evaluation policies. The document includes a paper that reports on the specific nature of state-level teacher performance evaluation policies and analyzes two philosophically different state-level performance evaluation policies--the dominant behavioristic evaluation policy and the emerging holistic evaluation policy. The main body of the publication consists of a chart entitled "Performance Evaluation of Experienced Teachers in the United States," a state-by-state factual compilation of each state's approach to performance evaluation of experienced teachers. Throughout the analysis, the argument is made for a major change in states' teacher evaluation policy directions toward one that better accommodates the needs of teachers. Before analyzing the specific nature of state-level teacher performance evaluation policies, an overview of the extent of state-involvement is provided. A performance evaluation questionnaire is appended. (Contains approximately 80 references.) (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 373 054

TRENDS AND ISSUES PAPER • NO. 10

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR EXPERIENCED TEACHERS: AN OVERVIEW OF STATE POLICIES

Eileen Mary Sclan
Teachers College Columbia University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Published by
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle • Suite 610 • Washington, DC 20036-1186

ERIC®

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AACTE

SP035401

TRENDS AND ISSUES PAPER • NO. 10

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR EXPERIENCED TEACHERS: AN OVERVIEW OF STATE POLICIES

Eileen Mary Sclan
Teachers College Columbia University

Published by
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle • Suite 610 • Washington, DC 20036-1186
July 1994

CITE AS:
Sclan, E. M. (1994). *Performance evaluation for experienced teachers: An overview of state policies* (Trends and Issues Paper No. 10). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education.

MANUSCRIPTS:
The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education invites individuals to submit proposals for writing Trends and Issues Papers. Proposals should include:

1. A detailed manuscript proposal of not more than five pages,
2. A vita, and
3. A writing sample.

PREPAID ORDERS:
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
(202) 293-2450
$14.50 (includes shipping and handling)

ISBN: 0-89333-123-6

Office of Educational Research and Improvement U.S. Department of Education

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number RR 93002015. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

I. The Extent of State Involvement 4

II. Hierarchical Versus Participatory Evaluation 6
- The Need for a Changing Teacher Role 6
- MacGregor's Theory X and Theory Y in Schools 7
- Future Directions for School Organization 9

III. The Nature of Performance Evaluation Criteria 10
- Differences Among State-Developed Criteria 10
- Teacher Growth 11
- Conceptions of the Role of the Teacher 12
  - Teacher as a Compliant Technician—Behavioristic Approach 12
  - Teacher as a Thinking Professiona—Holistic Approach 16
- Summary of Performance Evaluation Criteria Policy Trends 19

IV. Policy Implementation and Conclusions 20

V. Summary Chart: Performance Evaluation of Experienced Teachers in the United States 23

Appendix 67

References 69

Introduction

This paper reports recent trends in the establishment of state-level policies for the performance evaluation of experienced teachers and is intended as an accompanying piece to Beginning Teacher Performance Evaluation (Sclan & Darling-Hammond, 1992), which reports similar trends.[1] "Trends" are defined in this paper as the prevailing state-sanctioned currents of thinking that undergird teacher performance evaluation policies. How states develop and implement their policies varies greatly, though two general patterns are discernable. This document contains (1) a paper that reports on the extent of state involvement and analyzes two philosophically different state-level policies and (2) a chart entitled "Performance Evaluation of Experienced Teachers in the United States." Throughout the analysis, the argument is made for a major change in states' teacher evaluation policy directions, one which better accommodates the needs of teachers. The chart is a state by state factual compilation of each state's approach to performance evaluation of experienced teachers. This report is intended to be useful to legislators, policymakers, researchers, teachers, administrators, parents, and all those concerned with quality evaluation for experienced teachers.[2]

The state role in defining and developing evaluation systems for teachers has been expanding during the past decade (Rebell, 1990). The vast majority of state legislatures and state departments of education (SDEs) have been responding directly to calls to improve the quality of teaching (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Carnegie Forum, 1986) by developing new teacher evaluation systems or by updating already existing systems.[3] Even so, research shows that most teacher evaluation systems are meaningless and sometimes very expensive wastes of time (Darling-Hammond, 1986; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Rowan, 1990). State

[1]"Experienced" teachers are usually defined by the states as those who have demonstrated a mastery of teaching beyond the novice stage as identified by attainment of tenure or a more advanced career ladder status or simply by experience beyond 1, 2, or 3 years of teaching (see chart). Still other states make no distinction between beginners and more experienced or accomplished teachers. Only Kansas, South Carolina, and Tennessee differentiate between beginners, apprentices, and more experienced teachers.

[2]This chart was originally compiled from a literature review in July 1992 and from survey (see Appendix) and/or telephone responses from the state departments of education from 47 states and the District of Columbia during 1992. During the fall of 1993, updated information was obtained from the following state departments of education: Arizona, California, Connecticut, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nevada, Louisiana, and South Carolina. Due to nonresponse of North Carolina, Mississippi, and Indiana, information for those states was based solely on the literature review. References consulted in the compilation of the chart include: Beckham (1981); Bray, Flakus-Mosqueda, Palaich, & Wilkins (1985); Flakus-Mosqueda (1986); French, Holdzkom, & Kuligowski (1990, April); Slattery & Hall (1988); Tyson-Bernstein, (1987); Rebell (1990); and Valentine (1990, April).

[3]In the last decade many states experimented with merit pay schemes, career ladder programs, mentor teacher programs, licensure and certification regulations, alternative forms of evaluation (e.g., portfolio), and tenure statutes.

policymakers and educators have developed teacher evaluation instruments that would "rid classrooms of incompetents, improve the performance of the average teachers, and differentiate and reward the expert pedagogue. Unfortunately, there is little evidence that many of the state-mandated teacher evaluation systems fulfill any of the above mentioned purposes" (Berry & Ginsberg, 1989, p. 125).

State-level teacher evaluation policies tend to be either uniquely behavioristic or holistic (i.e., an amalgam of teaching, learning, and organizational theories). Although performance-based evaluation represents an improvement over unidimensional paper-and-pencil tests, behavioristic criteria used in most performance evaluation systems specify that teachers use a predetermined instructional model, which can constrict teachers' thinking and creativity (Shymansky & Penick, 1981). Many states ignore the complex nature of teaching and learning by adopting and institutionalizing performance evaluation systems that focus on narrow behavioral criteria (see chart). Although behavioristic policies have dominated the newly developed state-level programs during the last decade, plans for more holistic approaches to teacher performance evaluation have recently begun to evolve in a few states.

The behavioristic approach to evaluation runs contrary to the emerging professional models of teacher evaluation using criteria that require teachers to exercise careful judgment in their everyday practice (Darling-Hammond, 1986; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989). Educational reformers have been calling for more opportunities for teachers to become more reflective/analytic practitioners (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989; Shanker, 1985). What I call the holistic approach to teacher evaluation encourages teacher reflection by drawing not only from behavioral psychology, but also from what we know about cognition, child development, motivation and behavior, subject-specific pedagogy, organizational theory, and effective schooling.

The bureaucratic behavioristic approach achieved efficiency during the early era of our public school system, during the first part of this century when most students did not graduate from high school and when many people worked in factories. Today, the bureaucratic structure of schools works against efficiency. Teachers are judged by society today on how well they prepare students to learn how to learn, to perform creatively, and to adapt to a variety of situations in a postindustrial economy. Yet, many school systems still evaluate teachers according to a narrow prescriptive set of behaviors that reinforce a formulaic rather than a creative and analytic way of teaching (Macmillan & Pendlebury, 1985; Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1987; Valentine, 1990, April).

Because evaluation systems can affect teaching content, strategies, and student learning (Gersten, Carnine, Zoref, & Cronin, 1986), it is important to understand the nature of the evaluation systems and their underlying assumptions about teaching and

teacher learning. This paper examines the dominant behavioristic and the emerging holistic state-level performance evaluation policies for experienced teachers, so that we can better understand how these evaluation policies affect teachers and students.

Before analyzing the specific nature of state-level teacher performance evaluation policies, an overview of the extent of state involvement is presented in the next section.

I. THE EXTENT OF STATE INVOLVEMENT

Although state activity concerning teacher performance evaluation policy continues to accelerate, there is wide variation in state involvement with teacher evaluation. A small minority of states (Massachusetts, Michigan, and Rhode Island) have no evaluation requirements whatsoever. Maryland, New Hampshire, and Vermont follow nearly the same approach, but they do recommend that districts develop their own evaluation systems. The following states require local districts to adopt or develop their own evaluation policies and procedures and they do not require them to follow state guidelines for evaluation criteria: Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Although these 15 states are similar in their approach to evaluation policy, there are some minor differences. Evaluation policies, for example, in Mississippi and North Dakota may vary from school to school, not just district to district; and some districts in Utah have developed local career ladder programs.

Another 14 states (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Kansas, Maine, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Washington), require local districts to adopt or develop their own policies and procedures, but they require districts to follow general state guidelines for evaluation criteria (or at least to obtain SDE approval). There are subtle differences among these states too. More specifically, Colorado requires districts to create local evaluation advisory councils; Maine requires districts to develop voluntary local master teacher programs; Alaska, Arizona, Kansas, and New Jersey have developed guidelines that are more procedural in nature (Arizona's more substantive observation criteria are only "suggested" and are presently under revision); Oregon, Washington, and Connecticut have developed guidelines that include general areas of teaching competencies; Nevada requires local districts to obtain state approval; Pennsylvania offers a brief state-developed rating form, which most districts use. Virginia has developed a more detailed observation evaluation record form, but to be used only as a resource.

Moving toward a more prescriptive vein, the remaining 15 states have developed detailed evaluation policies, procedures, and classroom observation instruments; some of these state systems are optional and some are required (see chart). (See section III, "The Nature of Performance Evaluation Criteria," for a detailed discussion.) Of these states, Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas have developed the strictest behavioral criteria for performance evaluation. Although the criteria are not as behaviorally regimented, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and West Virginia require local districts to adhere to the particular state-developed competencies in developing local evaluation instruments and procedures. In Illinois and Missouri, most districts use the state-developed criteria or models. The District of Columbia requires a standard rating form containing a listing of teaching competencies.

Although the expressed good intention and ultimate goal of state legislators and state policymakers is to improve teaching, many evaluation systems developed and/or required by legislatures and/or SDEs may in the end have disadvantageous consequences for both teachers and students (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990). That is, states that use narrow, prescriptive, and highly detailed competency criteria may restrict teacher and student learning to predetermined modes of behavior. On the other hand, those states that provide general guidelines that call for reflective, analytic, creative thinking expect teachers to be the ultimate judges of whether particular approaches are best for their students, given the students' unique circumstances and situations.

Highly prescriptive, behavioristic criteria are usually implemented within a hierarchical mode, whereby principals/administrators evaluate teachers. In contrast, holistic criteria are frequently found within a participatory mode, whereby teachers evaluate each other. These contrasting modes of governance are discussed in the next section.

II. HIERARCHICAL VERSUS PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION

The Need for a Changing Teacher Role

Of the states that require training for teacher performance evaluation, the vast majority of states do not provide preparation for practicing teachers themselves to become evaluators. So it is not surprising that in a nationwide survey 94% of teachers report that principals have the major role in evaluating teachers, 5% report that it is "someone else," and only 1% report that teachers have the major role (Carnegie Foundation, 1990, p. 233). Equally important, fewer than half the teachers in another national survey attributed supportive and encouraging behaviors to their supervisors; and only 54% of the teachers in a New Jersey survey felt that their supervision process was fair (Corcoran, 1990). Similarly, Rosenholtz (1989) found that nearly two-thirds of the stratified random sample of elementary teachers in Tennessee challenged the legitimacy of the evaluation procedures used in the career ladder program, and 82% thought that even mediocre teachers could reach the highest levels. Most states with a formally developed teacher performance evaluation policy report that performance improvement is a main goal. If this is true, it seems counterproductive to exclude teachers from evaluation training.

Despite the fact that most teachers still work in isolated environments with little opportunity to interact with colleagues each day, teachers get most of their new ideas about instructional practice from other teachers, not from principals or other administrators (Choy et al., 1993). Although Berry and Ginsberg (1989) found that teachers believe that their peers are better judges of their teaching performance than are school administrators, states require evaluation training for people who work outside the classroom. Training is required for all evaluators (the vast majority of whom are administrators, SDE people, or university faculty) in the following states: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas—and recommended in Missouri.

Among those states that require training for evaluators, Connecticut is the only state that requires evaluation training for the teachers themselves; but this training is intended to provide an understanding of how they are evaluated as opposed to training teachers to become evaluators. However, the expressed belief at the Connecticut SDE is that the teacher is the "primary evaluator" (Regan, Anctil, Dubea, Hofmann, & Vaillancourt, 1992)—a principle that has not been declared as official policy by any other SDE. Although teachers in Vermont are relicensed by boards of their peers, it is still the principal who does the classroom observations and evaluation reports.

Principals are required to evaluate teachers even though they are not necessarily in the best position to do so. Annual evaluations of competent, experienced teachers may communicate distrust, far from what is needed to strengthen professional cultures. Most principals, uncertain about the efficacy of their evaluation efforts and lacking sufficient time, engage in only the minimum number of evaluations and expend little time on these tasks (Duke, 1993, May). In fact, Natriello and Dornbusch (1980) found in their study that teachers received evaluation only once every 3 years. Yet, evaluation must be frequent for it to be meaningful to teachers (Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, & Bernstein, 1985). As an example of what might be considered as typical among those states that have developed evaluation systems, the required evaluation system in Arkansas contains 42 descriptors and 118 indicators of behavior, but only two, 30-minute observations are required per year. It may be more beneficial and efficient to provide supports and time during the school day, which allow experienced teachers to tap into a broader knowledge base of teaching and learning, to observe each others' classrooms, and to confer about teaching performance.

The call for peer review one decade ago (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) has been virtually ignored by the states, possibly because new social organizational structures in schools are needed before peer evaluation can function successfully. The process of administrators evaluating teachers, one of the many regularities in schools, maintains the status quo of an institutional structure in which teachers are expected to do what they are told, to comply with rules from above. The present bureaucratic cell-like structure of schools makes it nearly impossible for teachers to perform in differentiated roles and difficult for teachers to work collaboratively.

In contrast, the prospect of teachers functioning as evaluators encourages increased flexibility within the school organization to allow for overlapping and varied roles. When authority to perform varied job tasks is based on ability, rather than on hierarchical position, schools can become more adaptable to the needs of their students (Sergiovanni, 1989).

MacGregor's Theory X *and* Theory Y *in Schools*

Assumptions about people are evident by the beliefs, behaviors, and expectations that are sometimes taken for granted in workplaces (Goldman, 1983). Although many in private industry have long abandoned the assumptions of Theory X—that people by nature are basically lazy and therefore must be controlled and directed—it is clear that most schools still operate according to these assumptions. The old model of organizing schools around Theory X assumptions has prevailed since the turn of the last century; it provided standardized operating rules and procedures for evaluation and allowed

schools to operate efficiently. Whereas division of labor among employees may have achieved a certain level of efficiency in the early days of an expanding public school system, today it obstructs efficiency by working against collaborative norms and behaviors that go into building strong collegial school cultures associated with student learning (Little & McLaughlin, 1993; Lieberman, 1988; Rosenholtz, 1989).

In bureaucratic organizations, the employee and the organization are often at odds with each other (Goldman, 1983). Teachers experience a dual accountability dilemma, for example, in which they must adhere to specified procedures of teaching that may conflict with what is best for particular students under an entirely different set of circumstances (Darling-Hammond, 1986). Inevitably, in order to survive, many teachers conform to school, district, or state-mandated behaviors, which may not always be in the best interests of their students. Policies that reinforce routine ways of teaching serve only to demoralize the teachers and may drive the most talented ones out of the field (Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple, & Olsen, 1991; Sclan, 1993).

The almost intractable isolationist norms and hierarchical communication mechanisms in many schools prevent teachers from talking with each other, from sharing instructional materials, from communicating with parents, from observing in each others' classrooms, and from evaluating each other on a regular basis (Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Lieberman & Rosenholtz, 1987; Rosenholtz, 1989). With few opportunities to learn from colleagues, teachers tend to feel more uncertain about their practices, and, in turn, are more likely to perceive requests for help as a sign of performance inadequacy (Glidewell, Tucker, Todt, & Cox, 1983; Rosenholtz, 1989). Thus, a cycle of professional uncertainty perpetuates itself where isolation becomes both a cause and an effect.

To address this widely known problem, some school systems have begun to require teacher collaboration. But when collaboration is mandated it does not evolve from the everyday working needs of teachers and students.[4] This form of hierarchical control, cloaked in the mantle of collaboration, works against professional growth. Evaluative feedback from peers, for example, that does not respond to the current needs of teachers is not likely to enhance professional development (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992). A truly collaborative culture is one that teachers build themselves and one that embraces the belief that teachers will continually learn—when given the chance (Lieberman, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Moving on to a more positive set of assumptions about people, Theory Y holds that work is natural to human beings if it is satisfying and that people will exert self-control and self-direction toward any goals to which they are committed (Goldman,

[4] "Contrived collegiality," characterized by a set of formal bureaucratic procedures created and imposed administratively to increase teacher interaction, creates a very different form of teacher collegiality than one that grows out of a collaborative culture that is created by teachers themselves (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992).

1983). Evaluation that moves away from reliance on strict compliance with rules toward reliance on teacher judgment and feedback from peers creates a culture in schools that reflects the belief that teachers are responsible professionals (Boles & Troen, 1994, April). Peers must define "standards of practice because specialized expertise is the basis for informed judgment" (Darling-Hammond, 1984, p. 17).

When teachers begin to function in roles as evaluators, they learn from each other in a nonthreatening way and, therefore, are strengthening their skills in a natural ongoing fashion. In fact, peer reviewers, as opposed to administrator reviewers, tend to be more discriminating between instructional materials that demonstrate high quality in teaching (McCarthey & Peterson, 1988). Moreover, the peer review process itself appears to "generate professional standards and expectations, rather than a mere application of them" (McCarthey & Peterson, 1988, p. 266). In a wide-scale study of effective teacher evaluation practices, Wise and his colleagues (1985) conclude that teacher involvement and responsibility improve the quality of teacher evaluation: "Teachers serving in various differentiated staff roles give their peers the kind of leadership and assistance that promotes the development and dissemination of professional standards of practice" (p. 110).

Future Directions for School Organization

Some researchers predict that in redesigned, postindustrial school organizations, the metaphor of "teachers as workers" will be replaced with "teachers as leaders" (Murphy, 1992). In these new schools, it will be natural for teachers to take more active roles in peer review and performance evaluation. However, reallocation of authority must be accompanied by capacity building of teachers. Because teacher collaboration, for example, predicts learning opportunities (Rosenholtz, 1989), time must be built into the day for collaboration. For those who conceive of teaching as complex and nonroutine, it is clear that the traditional bureaucratic structures of schools only hinder teacher and student learning. Indeed, successful districts provide personalized rather than standardized help for their teachers—which, in turn, allows faculties to shape their own learning and to enlarge their pedagogical repertoires (Rosenholtz, 1989).

The obsolete hierarchical organization of schools and procedures for evaluating teachers will have to give way to a more collegial, interdependent, organic, professional culture (Sergiovanni, 1991)—where teachers are expected to integrate the knowledge base of teaching and learning with their professional judgment. If teachers were given the time and resources to learn from each other, the few who do deteriorate to the remedial level and who require assistance might never reach that point. Because organizational structures of schools and districts influence the behavior of teachers, changing the organization of schools and the teaching profession is the first step toward expanding opportunities for professional growth (Johnson, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989).

In the next section, holistic and behavioristic evaluation criteria are examined.

III. THE NATURE OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA

Differences Among State-Developed Criteria

The following 19 states have identified criteria for teacher performance evaluation: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina[5], Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Washington; all these states with the exception of Connecticut have derived the criteria for judging teachers largely from a process-product body of research known as "effective teaching" (which is based on correlational, experimental studies).

However, there are subtle policy differences that exist among these states. First, the policies vary by degrees of uniformity regarding enforcement within each state. Some states, such as Texas and Arkansas, require all teachers to be appraised with the same state-developed criteria, while other states, such as Oregon, South Carolina, and Virginia, only recommend their criteria as resources. Although local districts are not always required to use state instruments, many districts adopt or adapt state-developed criteria, especially when instruments have been developed in detail and when a substantial amount of money and effort have been invested in their development. The majority of local districts in Florida, for example, use the state instrument, the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS), along with locally developed procedures.

Another difference in state performance evaluation policies among the states concerns the degree of detail and the extent to which states have prescribed effective teaching behaviors. The criteria developed by Texas and Florida are two of the most prescriptive evaluation systems in which generic teaching behaviors are to be emulated by teachers, often regardless of their grade levels or their subject area specialties. In contrast, the criteria developed by Washington, for example, are brief and general, leaving the categories open to interpretation by local districts.

Finally, the most striking contrast in the state-developed evaluation criteria for experienced teachers pertains to the nature of the criteria. It is the kind of research that is emphasized in the criteria that ultimately defines the role of the teacher. Although Louisiana recently improved its performance evaluation format by including a descriptive review and analysis of teaching (not just a checklist), it still focuses on behavioral criteria from the effective teaching research.

---

[5]South Carolina is presently reforming all requirements and procedures for provisional, annual, and continuing (tenured) contract level teachers. The Assistance, Development, and Evaluation of Professional Teaching Project (ADEPT) will institute a significant departure from the current system. The emphasis will be on professional development and continuous growth, rather than the old form of evaluation for tenured teachers. The state is developing general guidelines for districts to use in creating their own professional development programs.

Contrasting views of the role of the teacher, reflective professionals versus technical workers, are most apparent in how states implement their evaluation policies in the classrooms. The expressed goal of state performance evaluation systems is to improve performance (which requires helping teachers to learn continually so they can create the best climate for student learning)—a commendable goal. However, upon implementation many teachers are judged in their classrooms by how well they follow detailed performance criteria with little opportunity for reflective, collaborative work. These conditions may then prevent teachers from ever reaching the worthwhile goal of improved performance.

Teacher Growth

The old factory-like structure of many of today's schools, which include hierarchical modes of teacher evaluation, perpetuates a narrow application of behavioristic technical evaluation criteria, often excluding opportunities for creative, flexible, adaptive thinking (Blase & Kirby, 1991; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Conley, Bacharach, & Bauer, 1989; Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Lieberman, 1990; Louis & Miles, 1990; Raudenbush, Rowan, & Cheong, 1992, April; Reyes, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1985b, January). When teaching is reduced to a checklist or a summary of disparate quantifiable behaviors, there is no room for any dialogue and there is nothing left for the teacher to do but to imitate these behaviors unquestionably. Behavioristic approaches to evaluation oversimplify teaching and undermine teachers' judgment (Wise et al., 1985). Evaluating all experienced teachers with the same detailed criteria may create disincentive for professional growth. Mastering behaviors from the effective teaching list does not guarantee that teachers will teach better (Rosenholtz, 1985a, May).

Indeed, growth can take many different directions; the important question for educators is whether growth in one particular direction may retard growth in general or in new directions (Dewey, 1938). Teachers who are required to adhere to a set of generic behavioral criteria may grow in that single direction, but they may never develop other teaching abilities that might spark a love for learning, or develop a sense of compassion, or encourage experimentation in their students.

Dewey (1928) envisioned the teacher's role 65 years ago as one in which the teacher uses individual and group intelligence, not ready-made formulas, to create the best conditions for learning:

> It is no longer a question of how the teacher is to instruct or how the pupil is to study. The problem is to find what conditions must be fulfilled in order that study and learning will naturally and necessarily take place. . . . The method of the teacher . . . becomes a matter of finding the conditions which call out self-

> educative activity, or learning, and of cooperating with the activities of the pupils so that they have learning as their consequence. (p. 204)

Dewey (1928, 1938) viewed the teacher as one who encourages continual growth. For teachers to achieve optimal conditions for their students' learning, they must have access to the entire knowledge base of teaching to suit their particular situations. Teachers are more likely to grow in the greatest number of ways when evaluation systems are responsive to what teachers say they need.

Teachers need resources and time for professional collaboration, which enable them to integrate the rich findings of the knowledge base of teaching and learning with their professional judgment (Lieberman, 1988; Little & McLaughlin, 1993). Evaluation criteria that nurture reflective thinking about all aspects of teaching and learning (not just effective teaching) will also sustain professional growth (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988).

Conceptions of the Role of the Teacher

Evaluation systems are often intended to maintain or change behaviors, but without any change in the status or range of the current position (Natriello, 1990). The nature of the criteria of every teacher performance evaluation system imparts its inherent assumptions about the role of the teacher. Some states have developed criteria during the past decade that reinforce a compliant, passive role, while recently other states have begun to sanction a reflective, active role for the teacher.

Teacher as a Compliant Technician—Behavioristic Approach

Teaching includes a myriad of unpredictable and complex interactions that cannot be arbitrarily separated without destroying the integrity of the process. Molecular views of teaching, which grew out of the behavioral psychology tradition of the earlier part of this century, ignore the complexity of teaching; teaching is defined as a series of discrete acts, but this view may reflect invalid assumptions about teaching and human behavior (Stodolsky, 1984). Many of the teaching behaviors in the effective teaching research (used as the basis for many state evaluation systems) are presented as disconnected bits of behavior. Even worse, these behaviors are prescribed with few exceptions for all teachers in all situations as effective. Brophy (in press, cited in Good & Mulryan, 1990) warns that:

> Research on teacher effects has been seriously misused in many teacher evaluation and accountability programs developed by state departments of education and local school districts. Any such effort that in effect imposes a single lesson format on all teachers in all teaching situations is simply invalid, and cannot

be justified by claiming that it is supported by research on teacher effects." (p. 207)

When teachers know that sets of behaviors have already been predetermined as acceptable or unacceptable, why should they experiment and use their own judgment? There is little incentive to work out unique lessons for challenging circumstances. A training note in the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (Texas Education Agency, 1990), a typical effective teaching, state-developed evaluation system, requires that: "If inappropriate [student] behavior does occur, teacher must specify expectations [to the students]" (p. 29). In this case, there is no room for the teacher to take an alternative more appropriate course of action, such as postponing the lesson entirely and starting over at another time.

Furthermore, the findings of the effective teaching research that support direct instruction strategies do not necessarily improve instructional processes that involve debate, discovery, role play, simulation, interpretation of literature, and creative writing (Good & Mulryan, 1990). In fact, effective teaching behaviors can be counterproductive to the instructional goals—reducing students' liking for a subject and even forcing students into a state of dependency on the teacher (Shymansky & Penick, 1981).

No educator would argue that to require teachers to emulate effective teaching behaviors—without regard to the teacher's role in mediating the characteristics and interests of students and subject matter—is bad teaching. Yet, state evaluation systems often ignore the fact that effective teaching behaviors vary by socioeconomic, mental, and psychological characteristics; by grade levels; and by subject areas (Berry & Ginsberg, 1989; Darling-Hammond with Sclan, 1992). The effective teaching research findings produce no simple answers to the complex activities of teaching and learning.

Observation instruments that overemphasize effective teaching research tend to reinforce a behavioristic way of viewing teachers. Alabama, for example, requires observers to divide lessons into 7-minute periods—a 5-minute "scan" and a 2-minute "coding rest"; a minimum of five scans must be recorded for each teacher per observation. The following detailed directions for coding capture the dominant mechanistic tone of this system:

> After the teacher action, the student(s) should have either complied (mark comply) or continued or escalated or de-escalated their behavior (mark appropriate bubble under student behavior-result and also begin a new row by marking the appropriate student behavior-cause section). If the teacher takes no action, mark the student behavior-result section either when the student becomes compliant (back on task) or at the end of the five-minute period. If the five-minute period ends and the

> student(s) is still waiting or digressing, the appropriate bubble should be marked. If the off-task behavior continues into the next scan, mark the appropriate student behavior-cause section at the beginning of the new scan. Each row of bubbles represents an instance or situation. . . . (Alabama SDE, 1992, p.10)

Another example from Alabama illustrates how teachers are penalized if they say: "I'm having a hard time thinking of an example for you. Can anyone give us an example of velocity?" In this case, the teacher may have been attempting to draw out students' naive conceptions in order to connect the topic at hand with what they already know. Research findings in cognitive psychology demonstrate that already held organized knowledge of the world affects how new knowledge is acquired and created (Bransford, 1984). No set of behavioral criteria could even begin to uncover the complexities of teachers' decisions each minute of the day. No such instrument could capture the essence of the 200 to 300 interpersonal exchanges, for example, that occur each hour between elementary teachers and their students (Jackson, 1968). Evaluation systems that enforce compliance with behaviors that elicit the sought after bubbles in the boxes reinforce a constricting role for teachers and restrict access to a wider array of knowledge about teaching and learning, which includes the importance of the subtleties and nuances of teaching.

Another behaviorally oriented evaluation system, the Florida Performance Management System (FPMS), may be the most elaborate and extensively researched system in the country (in terms of the process-product literature on teaching effectiveness).[6] The FPMS contains 6 domains, 31 concepts, 121 indicators, and 191 examples of positive and negative teacher and student behaviors.

The FPMS is promoted as reliable and valid, but it is reliable and valid only regarding one genre of research, the effective teaching research (which includes process-product and experimental studies on teacher behavior, student achievement, and conduct). More importantly, the validity and reliability studies prove nothing about the sensitivity of the FPMS to the complexities of teaching and learning or about teacher growth in its broadest sense. In fact, Peterson and Comeaux (1990) found that of the teachers in their study those who perceived the FPMS negatively cited its reducing "the importance of context in making evaluative judgments about a teacher's teaching" (p. 18).

Examples are provided in the Domains manual to illustrate effective teaching behaviors (Florida SDE, 1992a). The distinctive behavioristic tone of the examples

[6]The only other system that may rival this one is Tennessee's, which includes a 246-page orientation manual, team appraisal score assignment sheets, various observation instruments, questionnaires, rating sheets, score records, score computation sheets, feedback checklists, dialogue translation scales, interview forms, and so on.

portrays teachers more as technicians than as professionals. The FPMS manual (Florida SDE, 1992b) reads like the old teacher-proof teachers' manuals for textbooks from the 1970s, which include word for word what teachers should say within lessons. The following is one concrete example from the FPMS that depicts teaching as a matter-of-fact activity:

> This involves a teacher evaluating learners' end-states: They followed three commands. Both groups did this successfully. And that's what the district guide said they had to do—three commands. (p. 19)

It appears that teachers are expected to follow what has already been established—in either district curriculum guides, teachers' editions, or state evaluation manuals.

Along the same pattern, another example is provided as model teacher behavior. A teacher in this example says, "My goal is to have this group through Level 6 by the end of the year" (p. 16). This statement is supposed to represent commendable behavior because the teacher is identifying expected outcomes. However, in this case—aiming to merely cover the material can deflect attention from ways to motivate the students about the content, a more important goal.

The following example on wait-time clearly illustrates another FPMS model behavior, to the 10th of a second: "Wait-time [after questions to students] needs to be at least 2.7 seconds long in order to be effective" (p. 115). One wonders what happens to teachers who only wait 2.6 seconds. Do they receive an ineffective rating?

Clearly, these exemplary behaviors lack any spark of creativity, professional problem solving, or individual teacher initiative, or for that matter any sense that teachers and students are thinking, feeling human beings. Nowhere in the examples for planning lessons is there anything about using subject matter to learn about human compassion, for example. There are, however, many statements about using dittos, worksheets, teachers' editions, and curriculum guides to master the subject matter for its sake alone. While prescriptive programs simplify the task of evaluation, they create problems of their own. By specifying beforehand what teachers can and cannot do, highly prescriptive standards may put obstacles in the way of individual growth and motivation, causing teachers to focus more on compliance than on their own effectiveness (Sclan & Darling-Hammond, 1992).

Because the effective teaching literature offers only one way to improve teaching, we must be careful not to close out other avenues of teacher growth (Zumwalt, 1986). State performance evaluation policies for experienced teachers must allow for multiple paths toward improvement. Sergiovanni (1989) asserts that the scientific findings from the effective teaching research are improperly used in educational practice and that:

> we should avoid fetish allegiance to a single line of research. We need to view research findings, however discovered, less as truths and more as insights and understandings. The purpose of research in our field is not to discover the right answer but to help better understand the conditions of our practice." (p. 101)

Other bodies of research that are often excluded in state schemes include cognition, child development, motivation and behavior, subject-specific pedagogy, organizational theory, and effective schooling (Knapp, 1982, March; Darling-Hammond with Sclan, 1992).

On an optimistic note, in a parallel movement and despite the shortcomings of the FPMS, the educational leadership at the state level in Florida has recently started a professional conversation among educators about how to link evaluation of teacher performance, teachers' professional development, and school improvement (Barth, forthcoming), an encouraging turn toward increasing teacher professionalization. In fact, at least 5 of the 67 districts have already created systems that purport to connect assessment, development, and improvement (Gardner, forthcoming). With the support of the SDE, educators have begun to articulate growth-oriented approaches to teacher evaluation that rely on research generated from the areas of adult learning, organizational contexts of schools, and school improvement/change. State-level policymakers are beginning to define teacher evaluation in terms of its effects on teacher growth, rather than teacher compliance.

Teacher as a Thinking Professional—Holistic Approach

Rather than a prescriptive view, a more dynamic view of teaching is emerging from the fields of cognitive psychology and sociological: organizational perspectives of learning. In this vein, knowledge "depends on the values of the persons working with it and the context within which that work is conducted" (Lotto & Murphy, 1990, p. 82, cited in Murphy, 1992). A few states have recently begun to incorporate more inclusive criteria in their teacher performance evaluation policies.[7]

One State's Evaluation Efforts to Promote a Professional Role for Teachers. Connecticut's clearly articulated vision of the role of the teacher is consistent with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' (1989), which advocates a more "proactive and creative role" for teachers as an integral part of "productive learning communities." While the state establishes priorities and goals for schools, teachers decide "what constitutes valuable learning for students" (p. 11).

The Professional Educator Development Program (PED) (Connecticut SDE, 1993) redefines the role of the teacher as

[7]Local and state efforts to create new evaluation and professional development plans that support more professional roles for teachers are emerging in California, Connecticut, Florida, Minnesota, New York, South Carolina, Texas, and Washington.

> three-dimensional in nature. In addition to the teaching dimension, there are dimensions of learning and leading. Together these three dimensions embrace the myriads of behaviors that need to be present in the life of an exemplary teacher. The expectation is that teachers continue to grow in each dimension of their professional self by engaging in on-going reflection upon their work, by ever adding to their repetoire of teaching skills and knowledge, and by accepting responsibility for student performance and for providing an environment that fosters an enabling school culture. (p. 3)

Connecticut increases the avenues of professional growth and responsibility for teachers by expanding their roles.

The evaluation efforts of the Connecticut Department of Education appear to be in the forefront of state-level reform regarding teacher professionalization. In their new evaluation plan, they address the central need to confirm teachers' differentiated roles as professionals. Connecticut legislatively links teacher evaluation with professional development, which inevitably strengthens teacher professionalism and school performance.

The common theme that runs throughout all of the Connecticut evaluation materials for experienced teachers is that supporting ongoing professional development is more helpful than enforcing minimal levels of competency. Clearly, in this case the activity of teaching is viewed by the Connecticut SDE as more than imitating effective teaching behaviors that increase scores on standardized tests, which may not always measure critical-creative thinking skills. Rather, teaching is considered to be a complex process whereby teachers develop norms of personal responsibility, independent and collegial judgment, and initiative. Because providing professional development opportunities is recognized as an integral part of the evaluation process for experienced teachers, it is not surprising that the Connecticut SDE aims to strengthen the capacity of districts to provide resources for ongoing professional development.

Because the Connecticut SDE views teaching as a complex and variable process, its approach to teacher performance evaluation relies more on teacher judgment than on rules made outside the classroom to orchestrate the daily interactions and experiences of those who live in classrooms. States cannot legislate one best set of teaching behaviors on a lesson-to-lesson, day-to-day basis. Because important context variables change the relationship between a given behavior and its outcome, truly effective teachers in fact vary their behaviors across teaching situations (Shavelson & Dempsey, 1976; Stodolsky, 1984).

The Connecticut SDE provides a buoyant, intelligent, and creative framework for state policymakers who are concerned with strengthening teacher professionalism (Regan et al., 1992). Connecticut's Professional Educator Development Model reconceptualizes learning and the role of the teacher and merges the processes of professional development, teacher education, and student learning. The program recognizes that successful plans are flexible and broad. They are also aware that supporting collaborative environments that enable and reward success is necessary so that teachers develop a sense of efficacy, which in turn allows them to change their behavior whenever necessary (Wise et al., 1985).

The distinction between professional development and evaluation for experienced teachers disappears in this scheme:

> The task of the educational system, then, has three components: helping these competent, experienced teachers to assess whether their students have indeed learned what we want students to know and be able to do; helping such teachers to develop ways of leading their students to ever higher levels of learning; and helping teachers remain connected to the wider world as a source of new information. This complex task demands both judgment and support; it includes both evaluation and development. We think it no longer makes sense to call it either, but rather to acknowledge that it is both at once. (Connecticut SDE, 1993, p. 2)

By assuming that "teachers do think for themselves, act independently, collaborate with others, and render critical judgments," Connecticut accepts "a priori that [teachers] are professionals as defined by Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988):

- They possess knowledge which is the basis of permission to practice and to make decisions on behalf of clients.
- They pledge their first concern to the welfare of their clients.
- They assume collective responsibility for the definition, transmittal, and enforcement of professional standards for practice and ethical behavior. (p. 3)

The Connecticut SDE's implementation approach exemplifies teacher performance evaluation policy at its best. It sets general but clear goals; it spells out assumptions about teaching and learning; it defines organizational conditions necessary for successful local development; it respects those who will implement and develop the details of the program at the district, school, and classroom levels.

Summary of Performance Evaluation Criteria Policy Trends

In our knowledge-based economy, teachers are expected to prepare students to think critically and creatively, which is far beyond what was required in our industrial economy of the earlier part of this century. Yet, many state performance evaluation systems over-emphasize behaviors derived from the effective teaching literature (correlational research findings) that discourage teachers from using the entire knowledge base. To make matters worse, teachers often do not even have the time or opportunity to think and to talk about the needs of their students.

Many teachers become successful by exerting extra energy to overcome their environmental constraints. In fact, most principals think that teachers in their schools are doing a fine job (Choy, Henke, Alt, Medrich, & Bobbitt, 1993). So it is not surprising when evaluation procedures that ensure minimal levels of competency become meaningless exercises for most teachers who are already performing adequately or better. It is clear that evaluation approaches are needed that go beyond minimum performance criteria; a built-in mechanism for on-going professional renewal that motivates teachers to achieve their fullest potential should be the hallmark of every teacher evaluation system.

For criteria to be useful, they must be situation-specific and responsive to the needs of the teachers and students (Wise et al., 1985). Otherwise, too many children will become alienated and fall between the cracks of the school system. When responsive evaluation practices foster teacher participation on a regular basis, new standards of practice will continually evolve, which in turn sustain professional growth.

Evaluation procedures that coerce teachers into complying with regimented sets of behaviors do not work in emerging reformed school environments that encourage teacher involvement in the running of their schools. As hierarchical controlling structures give way to environments that sustain collegial interactions, new forms of evaluation will naturally take root in schools.

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION AND CONCLUSIONS

The key arbiter of implementation of state policies regarding teacher performance evaluation turns on the questions: Is the goal to develop standardized behaviors that will then be prescribed? Or is it to provide resources that are available to be used as needed or as appropriate by teachers? Most states agree that performance improvement is a major goal of evaluation. Most states also agree on the general areas of competence for performance evaluation of experienced teachers: planning, classroom management, communication, instruction, assessment, and professional development. Although there is wide consensus on the general goals of evaluation and areas of competence for teachers, major differences in state policies only become apparent in the formal detailed plans of how to evaluate experienced teachers—the implementation phase.

The way policy is implemented determines its success, not just the content of policy. Shulman (1983) asserts that "The manner in which a policy is implemented may carry unintended consequences that dilute the very results the mandate was designed to achieve" (p. 490). That is, an implementation strategy that ignores organizational local considerations, for instance, may sabotage its own worthwhile goals.

The behavioristic approach to teacher performance evaluation reinforces a formulaic way of teaching—through mastery of discrete bits of behavior, independent of the context. In this case, when teachers are preoccupied with compliance issues, there is little time or motivation to reflect on the important issues, such as setting the stage for learning in their classrooms. Evaluation systems that emphasize discrete bits of behavior may compromise teachers' judgment, which reduces opportunities for capacity building. Furthermore, successful "implementation depends more on capacity than it does on compliance" (Elmore, 1983, p. 366).

Not coincidentally, states that stress the behavioristic approach to performance evaluation usually follow what Elmore (1983) calls a regulatory mode of implementation, whereby compliance is the central issue. Here, conclusions of process-product research are expected to be automatically converted into practice across the state, across all classrooms—regardless of teachers' and students' unique situations.

In this scheme, administrators are responsible for controlling teacher behaviors and for enforcing effective teaching behaviors as compiled by their state. Coercing teachers into a regimented set of behaviors reinforces an already narrowly conceived role of the teacher and inadvertently may prevent them from improving their performance. In fact, there is a danger that the behavioristic brand of state evaluation may counteract the positive effects of the new, more holistic professional standards

being developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1989) and a few other states (Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1988).

On the other hand, a few states have adopted a countervailing view to behavioral standards. That is, they believe that a holistic approach sustains a responsive way of teaching—through access to and application of various forms of knowledge and through reflective practice. This approach uses a programmatic mode of implementation—where capacity building is the central issue (Elmore, 1983). In this plan, teachers are considered the primary evaluators because it is they who must make the professional judgments about what is best for students on a day-to-day basis. Teachers in these settings are more apt to develop a wide array of behaviors, attitudes, and skills that become self-renewing; they find ways to sustain each other; and they lead their students down multiple paths to knowledge.

The next generation of evaluation systems will inevitably make little distinction between professional growth and evaluation. Eisner (1992) envisions evaluation as inherently part of the everyday worklife of teachers. His conception of evaluation captures the essence of the new wave of evaluation when he states that:

> Evaluation is an aspect of professional educational practice that should be regarded as one of the major means through which educators can secure information they can use to enhance the quality of their work. Evaluation ought to be an ongoing part of their work. Evaluation ought to be an ongoing part of the process of education, one that contributes to its enhancement, not simply a means for scoring students and teachers. (p. 625)

States that are aiming toward integrating evaluation procedures with the ongoing professional life of teachers are at the same time building self-renewing capacities for continual learning at every school site. Installing evaluation systems into schools without ongoing teacher participation ignores the people living in schools. On the contrary, merging evaluation designs with the everyday concerns and needs of teachers and students is more likely to support abiding professional growth. Evaluation systems must support teachers in their quest to teach responsibly and responsively.

IV. SUMMARY CHART: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF EXPERIENCED TEACHERS IN THE UNITED STATES

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF EXPERIENCED TEACHERS IN THE UNITED STATES[1]

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Alabama	Evaluation was mandated by the SBE in 1988 and legislated by the state in 1991. The state superintendent, SDE, and a task force (comprising educators, business/industry, parents, higher education, and professional organizations) developed evaluation criteria from empirical research and the best practices identified by state educators. The following state instruments are used in the Alabama Professional Education Personnel Evaluation Program: (1) Self-Assessment, (2) Observation Record, (3) Supervisor's Review Form, (4) Structured Interview, and (5) Professional Development and Leadership Summmary. Local districts are required either to implement the state evaluation system or to develop their own (with the state superintendent's approval), but they must use the state criteria. A minimum of two observations with pre/post conferences are required.	Eight competencies (with 26 indicators) were developed by the state in the following areas: (1) instructional preparation, (2) presentation of organized instruction, (3) assessment of student performance, (4) classroom management, (5) positive learning climate, (6) communication, (7) professional development and leadership, and (8) performance of professional responsibilities. Observers are identified by the local superintendent and must successfully complete 8-10 days of intensive training. Evaluation results are used to develop a professional growth plan, which describes in detail the goals/objectives; activities; source of assistance; and method of assessment, with a mid-year review and end-of-year assessment.
Alaska	The Career Incentive Program Act legislation requires performance evaluation annually according to general procedural state regulations for reemployment. Local districts define substantive performance evaluation criteria.	Varies from district to district. Evaluators must possess an administrative certificate in the state and usually use standard evaluation criteria.

[1]The following abbreviations will be used in this chart:
SDE = State Department of Education
SBE = State Board of Education
LEA = Local Education Agency

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Arizona	The state requires all teachers with more than 3 years of teaching to receive summative evaluations once a year (and those with less than 3 years of experience, twice a year) with evaluation instruments developed by the districts. In the district career ladder pilot programs, teachers in each district are assigned to a level based on competency and performance criteria in teaching skill, student progress, and instruction (and professional growth requirements in some districts).	The SDE suggests general criteria (now under revision), but they vary according to districts (215). Districts develop specific guidelines according to legal requirements (SBE and statute); compliance is monitored by the Career Ladder Advisory Committee and the SBE.
Arkansas	Districts are required to use state guidelines (developed in 1985) and to conduct two scheduled observations (one formal and one informal) per year for tenure/career status teachers; and at least one summative annual evaluation that goes to the district board of education is required for reemployment. A conference must follow each observation. Formative components include observations, feedback, and a written improvement plan.	Informal (unannounced) and formal (announced) observations must be a minimum of 30 minutes. Evaluators are usually administrators who must be trained by the SBE. Districts may add criteria in designing their own pre-observation form, observation form, Professional Growth Plan, and Individual Improvement Plan for those who need assistance. The required state criteria were based on research conducted by the state task force, which included university faculty. The state mandates the following competencies: (1) communication of content; (2) communication with students and parents; (3) student involvement and critical thinking; (4) class management/time; (5) atmosphere conducive to learning, self-discipline, and realistic, positive self-concepts; (6) instructional techniques/media; (7) individual and cultural differences; and (8) planning. Forty-two descriptors and 118 indicators were developed from the eight competencies.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
California	The state requires each district to establish standards related to: (1) pupil progress toward established achievement standards, (2) instructional techniques and strategies, (3) adherence to curricular objectives, and (4) the establishment and maintenance of a suitable learning environment. Certified teachers are evaluated biannually; an improvement program is required for teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations.	Varies from district to district.
Colorado	The state legislature mandates that local districts implement a performance appraisal plan for all certificated personnel. Observations and conferences are required "on a regular basis" and an improvement plan with a summary of strengths and weaknesses must be included in a written document. A remediation plan is required if performance is unsatisfactory.	Evaluation criteria and procedures vary from district to district. Local school districts are required to have an Advisory School District Personnel Performance Evaluation Council comprised of one teacher, one administrator, one principal, one parent resident, and one resident who is not a parent of a child in the district. A similar State Council is appointed by the SBE, which can be consulted by local councils. Evaluators must hold an administrator's certificate and complete state-approved training in evaluation (30 clock hours).

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Connecticut	State law requires local districts to establish comprehensive professional development plans and programs that incorporate teacher evaluation components (formative and summative). SDE general guidelines were adopted in 1990 for use in developing the programs with teacher representatives. At least one teacher evaluation report (summative and formative) must be submitted to the SDE every 3 years. Teachers with 3 years or more are no longer considered beginners. The state requires each district to describe its process for evaluating the achievement of its goals and to place a written report in the teacher's personnel file that includes an assessment of the extent to which the teacher fulfilled defined responsibilities and to which the objectives for growth were achieved. During the succeeding 3-year period of the Comprehensive Professional Development Plan (school years 1994-1995 through 1996-1997), professional development, teacher evaluation, and career incentives will cease to be considered as separate components and instead become a truly integrated entity with a common set of guidelines.	The Professional Educator Development Program operationalizes a merger of professional development and evaluation. Most districts define evaluation criteria around SDE guidelines and other constructs including the Common Core of Learning and Connecticut Teaching Competencies, which provide a broad, general description of good teaching and a set of expectations for teaching and learning outcomes. (Other criteria used are derived from local job descriptions, instructional improvement goals, and local board policies.) Local districts assign appropriate members of their staff as evaluators. State guidelines require training evaluators and call for explaining the district's evaluation process to teachers.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Delaware	SBE policy mandated tenured teacher evaluation as of 1990. Tenured teachers receive three narrative formative reports (which include conferences and observations, one of which is announced) during a 2-year cycle. At the end of every 2 years, the Delaware Performance Appraisal System (ratings and narrative) is used as a summative evaluation. Districts may create a 1-year cycle with two formative and one summative evaluations per year. An Individual Improvement Plan is required when performance is appraised as *unsatisfactory* or *needs improvement.*	Principals and/or assistant principals usually evaluate teachers using the Pre-Observation Form (for announced observations) and the Lesson Analysis and Performance Appraisal instruments. Generic evaluation criteria were drawn from research on effective teaching/schools by a committee of teachers and administrators. The following criteria categories must be used to evaluate teachers: (1) instructional planning, (2) organization and management of classroom, (3) instructional stategies, (4) teacher/student interaction, (5) evaluation of student performance, and (6) related responsibilities. The state also provides an additional 35 accompanying examples for the criteria.
District of Columbia	The D.C. Code of Regulations and Municipal Regulations require teacher evaluation. The Joint Board of Education and Washington Teachers' Union Committee create the evaluation goals. One observation and a conference is required per semester and one mid-year conference. All teachers are evaluated using a standard form: the Teacher Appraisal Process instrument (TAP).	Principals and assistant principals (after a minimum amount of training) observe teachers. The Joint Committee agreed upon criteria from research to be used for experienced teacher performance evaluation in the following areas: (1) instructional/case load, (2) management, (3) instruction, and (4) professional responsibilities. The components of the TAP include the Appraisee's Proposal Form A (the formative component) with a conference, observation, and postobservation conference; Form B for the mid-year conference; and Form C for the annual evaluation (and a conference) that is required for the summative component. An improvement plan with assistance from instructional support personnel (department chairperson or instructional supervisor) is provided.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Florida	Annual evaluation has been mandated by the state since 1961 through use of a district assessment system. The legislature created the goals, but districts are required to develop evaluation systems, which they may tie to reemployment. The most widely used summative observation instrument is the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS) (one part of the data used for annual evaluation). Teachers are usually observed by an evaluation team (two administrators and a peer teacher), who are trained to check frequencies of behavioral indicators. Tenure was eliminated in 1984; 2-year contracts are issued with renewal based on annual performance evaluations by trained supervisors. Two consecutive annual unsatisfactory evaluations may affect certification status.	Statute requires that evaluation be based on "sound educational principles and contemporary research in effective educational practices." The final evaluation form varies among local districts (67), but includes all of the following criteria required by the state legislature: classroom management, knowledge of subject matter, ability to plan and deliver instruction, and ability to evaluate instructional needs. Most districts have added another criterion: professional responsibilities. These categories of criteria used to judge teachers were developed from a statute that reflects effective teaching research and the best practice at the time. Selected university educators were involved in defining the criteria. The FPMS includes 6 domains, 86 indicators, and 191 examples of teacher behavior. The state requires that notification, explanation, assistance, and sufficient time (NEAT) be provided for teachers with unsatisfactory performance. Assistance may include the use of formative instruments and observations associated with a SDE-approved performance measurement system, such as FPMS.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Georgia	The Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP) was implemented by the state in 1989. The Reform Act requires annual performance evaluation of all teachers by a staff of trained evalutors. A professional development plan addresses identified needs and deficiencies with state-developed model instruments and state-trained evaluators; an annual salary increase is dependent upon this performance rating. Three observations are typically made by local administrators and are required during the school year (the first prior to January 1 conference) before a summary score is given for the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI). There is also a formative phase for teachers with more than 3 years of experience and a previous *satisfactory* score on the GTEP. Only one formative observation on the GTOI is required. The GTEP consists of two instruments, the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Duties and Responsibilities Instrument (GTDRI). A score of *satisfactory* on both is required. Professional development plans are written when assistance is required.	The GTOI includes effective teaching practices in the following areas: (1) provides instruction, (2) assesses and encourages student progress, and (3) manages the learning environment. The evaluation criteria are based upon research on effective teaching practices, results of piloting and statewide field testing, and input from statewide advisory groups. Georgia State University and the University of Georgia were also involved on statewide advisory groups in formulating the criteria.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Hawaii	The state requires that a rating be issued to teachers every 2 years for tenured teachers according to the Program for Assessing Teaching in Hawaii (PATH). Evaluation goals were developed by the SBE and SDE. The frequency of observations/conferences is flexible.	Using the computer-assisted teacher evaluation process (PATH), principals assess progress on individualized staff development programs and rate teachers as *satisfactory*, *marginal*, or *unsatisfactory*. A less than *satisfactory* rating may result in termination. Training for administrators is required. Evaluation criteria are contained in a single mandatory objective and a bank of over 300 optional objectives. The state contracted a consultant to develop PATH based on research and national banks of validated teacher performance objectives. University representatives were involved in the task forces that developed PATH and that validated its objectives.
Idaho	An annual evaluation is mandated by the state, but local school boards create the goals and procedures. One summative evaluation report is required every 2 years for certificated personnel (as of 1980). The purposes of evaluation have to do with reemployment.	Generally, an administrator visits a class with a checklist and writes observations; when problems are noted, assistance is required.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Illinois	The state legislature mandates at least one performance evaluation (summative) based on at least one classroom observation every other year for certified employees. The evaluation cycle includes a preobservation conference, data collection—including formal and informal classroom observation, postobservation conferences, and a formal summative evaluation conference where goals and objectives are established for improving teaching skills. Local school boards are required to establish and implement performance criteria, but must follow state regulations.	Most districts use the effective teaching research to develop their evaluation systems, usually in a clinical supervision framework. Standards of performance include (1) instructional planning [i.e., Madeline Hunter's model (Illinois State Board of Education, 1989)], (2) instructional methods, (3) classroom management, (4) competency in subject matter taught and services provided, and (5) professional responsibilities. Fifteen descriptors and 69 indicators of these standards were developed by the state. Administrators (with training) rate tenured teachers *excellent, satisfactory,* or *unsatisfactory* on summative evaluations. Some districts use a checklist while others use a narrative mode. Teachers rated *unsatisfactory* go on a 1-year remediation program in order to achieve a *satisfactory* rating or be dismissed.
Indiana	State law requires public schools to implement teacher performance evaluations as a condition of accreditation. Local districts develop their own evaluation plans.	Varies from district to district.
Iowa	The state requires districts (local boards of education) to establish evaluation criteria and to implement procedures.	Varies from district to district.
Kansas	The state requires that all districts create their own evaluation systems for all teachers according to general procedural state guidelines. All certificated personnel must be evaluated twice a year in the first 2 years; once a year in the 3rd and 4th years; and at least once every 3 years thereafter according to each board's evaluation procedure. Two classroom observations are required each year by a supervisor.	Varies from district to district.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Kentucky	By legislated mandate, districts evaluate all certified personnel with less than 5 years of teaching experience once a year. At least one summative evaluation report is required every 3 years for tenured/career status teachers.	Varies from district to district.
Louisiana	Teacher evaluation was mandated by legislative action in 1977, 1980, and 1992. In 1991, the state legislature suspended a statewide teacher assessment program and mandated the revision and reimplementation of the program in 1992-93. In 1992, legislation was passed extending the timeline for reimplementation to include small-scale field testing in 1992-93, larger-scale pilot testing in 1993-94, and implementation in 1994-95. In 1992, legislation mandated the revision of state guidelines and local personnel evaluation plans. An evaluation must be conducted for each experienced teacher based on observation at least once every 3 years. For the remaining 2 years of the cycle, evaluations may be based on professional growth and must include provisions for self-evaluation. Frequency of required observations vary by district.	SDE guidelines require that the evaluation instrument include the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (LCET) as the minimum criteria. However, districts are free to include criteria beyond the LCET. Local evaluation systems must include a descriptive review and analysis of teaching, rather than simply a rating scale or checklist. Provisions for professional growth and self-evaluation are also included. Annual evaluations are based on one or a combination of observations, progress toward the objectives in a professional growth plan, and/or self-evaluation. Typically, observations are announced or unannounced by the principal or other designated evaluators in the district and must include a preobservation conference. Assistance will be provided to any teacher whose performance does not meet the district's standards for satisfactory performance. Evaluation criteria are more uniform since adoption of the LCET, which includes planning, management, instruction, and professional growth (and/or responsibility). Consultants from Connecticut, Florida, Tennessee, and Texas contributed to the development of the LCET. All 70 local districts are required to develop accountability plans that follow state guidelines. Each district is monitored by the SDE every 3 years for compliance with state guidelines.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Maine	The state requires local districts to develop their own evaluation systems. Certificate renewal is centered around staff development in the local districts. All school districts have a master teacher program; the process takes from 18 months to 3 years depending on the district. Pilot studies in 20 sites for a career ladder structure are tied to new certification levels. Each local site develops its own criteria for each level of the career ladder. Teachers may volunteer for a master teacher certificate in the district's career ladder program.	Varies from district to district.
Maryland	The state recommends that LEAs implement their own evaluation systems. The teaching certificate must be approved every 10 years. LEAs use funds from the state to design career ladders and teacher evaluation schemes, but no career ladders have ever been funded.	Typically, the principal evaluates teachers with a checklist, but this varies from district to district.
Massachusetts	No state requirements exist for evaluation. Through the Professional Development Grant Program and the Horace Mann Teachers Program attention has been focused on teacher performance evaluation and development.	
Michigan	There are no regulations concerning veteran teacher performance evaluation.	
Minnesota	The state mandates districts to develop their own evaluation systems.	Varies from district to district.
Mississippi	The state requires two scheduled classroom observations and at least one summative evaluation report per year for tenured/career status teachers.	Supervisors usually conduct the evaluations. The procedures vary among the districts.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Missouri	At least one summative evaluation report is required every 3 years for tenured/career status teachers. The state requires districts to conduct performance-based evaluation. Along with a statewide committee, the University of Missouri was directly involved with developing the Performance Based Evaluation (PBE) framework for the state. Evaluations are used for reemployment, certificate renewal, performance improvement, and as the basis for voluntary career ladder participation. Local districts develop evaluation criteria, but they must use a PBE model.	An advisory committee was appointed to recommend evaluation guidelines and procedures. In addition to Madeline Hunter's work, research conducted in Florida, Georgia, and Iowa State University on effective teaching practices was used to develop the criteria. The PBE model includes the following general areas: (1) instructional practice, (2) classroom management, (3) interpersonal relationships, and (4) professional responsibilities (with 19 indicators and 99 descriptors). Most districts use the state model with local modifications. The formative components of the PBE model include goal setting/planning stage, observation, follow-up conference, job targets (assistance plan); the summative components include performance criteria ratings from *unsatisfactory* to *exceeds expectations—meets performance expectations* is the primary goal. Some districts evaluate annually, while others follow a 2- or 3-year cycle. Most evaluators, usually administrative staff, receive evaluation training.
Montana	The Montana Board of Public Education requires local districts to create their own evaluation policies and procedures for all certified teachers in accordance with accreditation standards.	Varies from district to district.
Nebraska	Legislation and SDE requires local districts to develop their own teacher evaluation systems, which are usually a performance checklist that is goal oriented.	Varies from district to district.
Nevada	Legislation requires teacher evaluation; at least one summative evaluation report is required per year for experienced/tenured teachers. (Teachers are eligible for tenure after their 1st year of teaching.) Districts must submit plans for teacher performance evaluation to the SDE.	Varies from district to district.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
New Hampshire	The state recommends, but does not require local districts to create local evaluation systems. There are no regulations concerning veteran teacher performance evaluation.	
New Jersey	Evaluation is mandated by the N.J. Administrative Code, annually for tenured staff (with at least one scheduled classroom observation); school districts (nearly 600) are required to develop local evaluation systems. After an annual summary conference between supervisor and teacher, a written summative performance report must be prepared by the supervisor.	Policies and procedures are to be developed under the direction of the district's chief school administrator in consultation with tenured teachers according to general state procedural regulations. The annual written performance report shall include at least the following: areas of strength, areas that need improvement, an individual professional improvement plan (developed by a certified supervisor—usually the principal or a subject matter specialist—and teacher), summary of indicators of pupil progress, and provisions for performance data, which may be entered by the teacher.
New Mexico	The SBE mandates an annual Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan (used for relicensure) for all teachers. The summative evaluation is comprised of the following: multiple observations, conferences, collaborative growth plan, and a recycling of the same. A professional development plan is developed collaboratively by the supervisor and teacher. Districts use the state plan/cycle, but develop/adopt their own instruments. All local districts must have a staff accountability plan including a teacher evaluation and growth plan that meets state guidelines.	Principals and content area specialists, who are trained in New Mexico's Six Essential Teaching Competencies, observe the teachers. The Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan was developed from existing research by a statewide committee (which included university faculty). The plan incorporates the following essential effective teaching competencies (with 31 descriptors and 63 indicators): (1) communication in content areas and professional rapport with students; (2) communication with students to enhance student learning; (3) appropriate use of teaching methods and resources; (4) encouragement of student involvement, responsibility, and critical thinking skills; (5) classroom management to maximize instructional time; (6) creation of atmosphere conducive to learning, self-discipline, and development of realistic and positive self-concepts.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
New York	The New York State Regents' Action Plan mandates that local school districts develop and implement annual performance evaluations of teachers.	Districts determine who evaluates teachers, how frequently they are observed, and the nature of the criteria.
North Carolina	The state requires three scheduled classroom observations and, for reemployment, one summative evaluation report per year for tenured/career status teachers. Although the state developed the Performance Appraisal System, which includes the Career Growth Plan, as of 1991 local districts are required to develop their own evaluation systems.	Discretion of local districts.
North Dakota	State law requires a written performance review: two evaluations are mandated each year for the first 3 years in each district by December 15 and March 15. Teachers with more than 3 years experience must be evaluated by March 15 once each year. These evaluations can form the basis for nonrenewal or dismissal for cause.	Evaluation procedures vary from district to district, but usually a school administrator observes once a year in the teachers' classrooms and then conferences with the teachers about the written review.
Ohio	State minimum standards require that certificated staff be supervised and evaluated according to a planned sequence of observations and conferences. Local school districts select/develop their own instruments and methods.	Varies from district to district.
Oklahoma	The state mandates an annual evaluation for re-employment (of tenured, experienced teachers). Districts (approximately 600) are required to create an evaluation system based on the criteria for evaluation known as the Minimum Criteria for Effective Teaching and Administrative Performance developed by a planning team of teachers, administrators, the SDE, and university members.	Local boards designate the observers; a mandated training SDE program is provided to all administrators who evaluate staff and if "weaknesses" are identified, assistance is provided. Formative components of evaluation vary from district to district. The summative component is drawn from the effective teaching literature.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Oregon	The state legislature mandates evaluation (with multiple observations) once every 2 years for permanent teachers. The Oregon Plan for Excellence, adopted by the SDE, requires local districts to improve their performance evaluation systems. District school boards are required to develop evaluation procedures with school administrators and teachers.	The state's general guidelines require that districts include the following in the evaluation process: performance standards; a preevaluation interview; evaluation based on written criteria, which include performance goals; and a postevaluation interview where a written program of assistance is established, if needed. The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission recommends that competent teachers demonstrate use of state- and district-adopted curriculum goals, skill in setting instructional goals expressed as learning outcomes, use of current subject matter appropriate to individual needs, use of students' growth/development patterns and needs in instruction, and skill in selecting and using teaching techniques conducive to student learning. Before evaluating teachers, principals or assistant principals are required to take one course on supervision and evaluation in a university certificate program. Evaluators must hold teaching certificates.
Pennsylvania	Legislation and SDE policy require at least one summative evaluation report, which includes at least one observation and a conference, per school year for tenured teachers. The legislature and the SBE created the goals for the evaluation process. Districts may use the state-developed Temporary Employee/ Professional Employee Rating Form or locally developed systems with state approval.	The superintendent or his/her designees observe the teachers. Districts typically use four general state criteria to judge teachers in the following areas: (1) personality, (2) preparation, (3) technique, and (4) pupil reaction. These categories, along with 19 general descriptors, comprise the Temporary Professional Employee/ Professional Employee Rating Form.
Rhode Island	No state requirements exist. Evaluation policies and procedures are determined solely by local districts.	Varies from district to district.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
South Carolina[2]	Annual contract teachers (typically 2nd-year teachers, but may be 3rd-year and 4th-year teachers) must be evaluated annually and it must include at least two observations. Teachers receive continuing contracts after they have successfully completed annual contract year(s). Continuing contract teachers must be evaluated at least once every 3 years, based on at least two observations. Evaluations must be conducted with a process developed or selected by the local district that adheres to SBE requirements that specify areas such as performance to be evaluated, data collection procedures, conferences, and uses of results. Evaluations may be used for employment decisions.	Through a review of the literature and a statewide survey, the criteria were defined in 10 broad areas, which cover traditional areas of performance associated with effective teaching (e.g., planning, instruction, management). The state developed an evaluation process that was offered to districts as an optional alternative to other processes available (Consensus Based Evaluation system). The criteria were developed and validated under a contract awarded to the College of Education of the University of South Carolina. Other colleges and universities were involved through the survey process. SBE regulations do not specify who must do observations, but they are typically conducted by building administrators. Districts are required to provide training for all observers. Results must be used to guide individual and group staff development programs. Instruments vary by district, but typically include review of long-range plan, reviews of written short-term plans (usually lesson plans), and observations of specific behaviors and skills during lessons.
South Dakota	Evaluation is required by legislation every 2 years; local districts must develop evaluation policies.	Teachers usually set up their own evaluations through negotiations; principals or the superintendent usually observe teachers once a year.

[2]South Carolina is revising its teacher performance evaluation criteria, which will be a significant departure from the present system. More emphasis will be placed on continuing professional development for continuing contract teachers.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Tennessee	Evaluation is mandated by the state legislature and the SBE. A two-track system is in place; as of 1987 teachers could volunteer for the career ladder program (not tied to licensing or employment), which offers pay supplements of $1,000-$3,000 per year, or they may remain as non-career ladder status. The Level I certificate, attained in the 4th year of teaching through local evaluations, is renewable after 10 years; during this time at least two full cycles of evaluation; in the final year of Level I, the SDE conducts verification evaluations similar to the apprentice level. Level II, attained in the 8th year through state evaluators, may be renewed after two evaluations (and three observations) during a 10-year period; Level III may be attained in the 12th year through state evaluators. (Teachers may remain at Level I, which requires two successful local evaluations in 10 years.) Non-career ladder tenured teachers must have two evaluations in 5 years (with two observations). Although a state evaluation system exists, districts may develop their own, but the state-developed competencies must be used and approval by the SBE is needed. An improvement plan is required.	The state legislature and SBE used the effective teaching research and input from teachers to develop the criteria used to judge veteran teacher performance in the following areas: (1) instructional planning, (2) teaching strategies, (3) use of evaluation, (4) classroom management, (5) professional leadership, and (6) basic communication skills—with a total of 18 accompanying indicators and 92 measurement statements. Local administrators evaluate non-career ladder teachers with the State Model for Local Evaluation while two state evaluators and one local administrator (or three state evaluators) evaluate career ladder teachers with the Career Ladder Evaluation System. Training is required for all evaluators. Career ladder evaluations for Levels II and III include classroom observations, dialogue sessions, principal questionnaire, professional development and leadership summary, a written test, and student questionnaire. A minimum score of 700 is needed to qualify for Level III and 600 for Level II. Local evaluations include an improvement plan and suggested modules.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Texas	The Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS), a career ladder system implemented in 1986, mandates that experienced teachers be observed at least two times a year (for 45 minutes) with at least two conferences at the second and third levels with the TTAS instruments—for reemployment. Experienced teachers who have passed the written portion of the master teacher exam receive only one appraisal (two observations) each year. Evaluation criteria and goals are defined by the SBE, which also included university educators. On the off years, districts are authorized to substitute a more formative system. A voluntary career ladder program that is a monetary supplement to the TTAS has been in place since 1986. Some districts have stricter performance criteria (higher scores on the TTAS) for career ladder advancement while other districts have waivers in order to formulate alternative appraisal systems.	As required by legislation, all teachers are appraised with the same criteria and in the same manner. University and college educators and TTAS appraisers were involved in defining the evaluation criteria. The TTAS focuses on generic teaching behaviors within the following domains: instructional strategies, classroom management and organization, presentation of subject matter, learning environment, and professional growth and responsibilities. The domains and indicators were derived from research and other states' evaluation systems (particularly Georgia's). Observers are typically the principal and a second appraiser (often an assistant principal or central office instructional coordinator or a university educator). Some districts hire "other appraisers" from outside consulting firms who are trained in a 40-hour course with proficiency tapes and a written exam. Teachers may take a TTAS workshop from a university, college, or 1 of the 20 regional service centers.
Utah	The state mandates districts to create local evaluation systems or to use an established evaluation tool. Tenured career status teachers are required by the state to have two scheduled classroom observations per year. In addition to standard evaluation systems, districts are encouraged by the state to develop career ladder programs, which are funded by the state. Due to the career ladder plan, most districts have revised their performance evaluation practices. Allocations to the 40 school districts are based on weighted pupils and the number of certificated educators in each district.	Administrators/supervisors evaluate teachers. There is no concensus on evaluation criteria within the state: Some districts use the Scales of Effective Teaching (SET) while others use the Clinical Supervision model. District-designed career ladder programs have followed 1984 guidelines established by the state legislature.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Vermont	The state recommends that districts implement teacher performance evaluation policies/practices, but there is wide variation among practices across districts. The purposes have to do with performance improvement and reemployment.	Usually, the principal observes in the classroom, conferences with the teacher, and writes formative and summative assessment reports. Teachers are relicensed by boards of their peers. Projects using portfolio evaluations in varying districts across the state are currently being piloted.
Virginia	The state mandates districts to create teacher evaluation systems based on the Standards for Accrediting Schools (SOA) for performance improvement, reemployment, and renewable certification. Usually the principal, department heads, and the central office supervisor at the local level develop the evaluation procedures. Legislation and SDE require at least one summative evaluation report every 2 years. The formative and summative evaluation processes are combined in a 2-year cycle.	The SOA includes general goals and guidelines for instruction and student achievement. Local school boards (133) develop their own formative components of the evaluation; the principal or designee evaluates the quality of instruction by writing objectives with the teacher, by classroom observations and follow-up consultations, by assistance, and analysis of data on pupil achievement. As a resource, the state has compiled evaluation criteria in seven domains: planning, instruction, evaluation and assessment, knowledge of subject, communication skills, managing a positive learning environment, and professional responsibilities (along with 23 indicators and 89 descriptors).

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Washington	Legislation and SDE policy require teacher evaluation. At least two scheduled observations (a minimum of 60 minutes each) and one summative evaluation report are required for all teachers. Local districts are mandated to develop a professional growth program (not related to reemployment) for certificated classroom teachers. The legislature appropriated funds to develop, field test, and pilot teacher evaluation models.	Principals or their designees evaluate teachers according to the following general areas of minimum criteria developed by the state legislature: (1) instructional skill, (2) classroom management, (3) professional preparation, (4) effort toward improvement when needed, (5) handling of student discipline and attendant problems, (6) interest in teaching pupils, and (7) knowledge of subject matter. Each district's Professional Growth Committee is required to use at least one of the following sources of information for teachers' professional growth program: peer review, parents, students, personal/professional goals, school district goals, building goals, self-assessment, personal academic records, and school district evaluations. The Professional Growth Committee must include certificated classroom teachers, certificated support personnel, central office administrators, building-level administrators, and additional persons if the district desires.

STATES	DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION POLICY	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
West Virginia	In 1992 the West Virginia Board of Education determined the criteria for evaluation, which are based on research and board initiatives, and requires LEAs to implement written administrative procedures related to the requirements of the state. For teachers with 3 to 6 years of experience, one written evaluation that includes two observations for at least 30 minutes each (and accompanying conferences) a year are mandated by the state. In the 7th year, the teacher moves to a 2-year professional growth and development cycle that alternates between two phases (I and II) provided: (a) performance was rated satisfactory during previous two evaluations, (b) a professional growth and development plan is developed, and c. the teacher remains in the same or similar position for two consecutive evaluations. If these provisos are not met, then one performance evaluation per year is required. A referral to an improvement team is made for teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations. Summative evaluations form the basis for personnel decisions.	The immediate supervisor (usually the principal) observes in the classroom. Teachers' performance criteria, developed from existing research, are general behavioral attributes that consist of the following categories: programs of study, classroom climate, instructional management systems, student progress, communication, and professional work habits. The criteria range from a general nature, such as, "interacts appropriately with other educational personnel" to the more specific, such as, "maximizes student time-on-task."
Wisconsin	The state requires districts to develop evaluation systems. Legislation and SDE policy require teachers to be evaluated every 3 years.	Varies from district to district.
Wyoming	Legislation requires teacher evaluation.	Varies from district to district.

APPENDIX

State _____
Your name _____
Title _____
Department _____

Please answer the following questions with regard to VETERAN (EXPERIENCED) TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (not first-year or beginning teachers):

1. State- or District-Level Policy
   a. Is veteran teacher evaluation in your state mandated by the state? If so, how and when?

   b. Does your state require districts to create their own evaluation system?

   c. Does your state not require but recommend districts to implement veteran teacher performance evaluation policy/practices?

2. Main Goals of Veteran Teacher Performance Evaluation
   a. Briefly describe these goals (e.g., performance improvement, evaluation, reemployment, renewable certification, etc.)

   b. Who or what body set these goals?

   c. If there is a "formative" component, briefly describe

   d. If there is a "summative" component, briefly describe

3. Criteria Definition
   a. Who defines the performance evaluation criteria? (State Board of Education, local districts, state legislature, etc.)

   b. If the state defines the criteria, what are the criteria used to judge veteran teacher performance competency?

   c. Where did the criteria come from? (based on what research; or on another state's system, etc.)

   d. Is there university-level involvement in defining the criteria? If so, briefly describe

4. Implementation and Nature of Criteria
   a. If the districts define their own criteria, is there any consensus about types of criteria or evaluation procedures used in your state and from where are they derived?

   b. Briefly describe one "typical" district's practices

c. Is there a wide range of different types of practices for veteran teacher evaluation across districts? If so, briefly describe two different types of district programs

5. Veteran Teacher Performance Evaluation Procedures
Check appropriate box:
____ state-level procedures
____ suggested
____ required
____ one example of district-level procedures

a. Frequency of observations, conferences

b. Who are the observers? And is training required?

c. Name of evaluation instrument(s)

d. Briefly describe the instruments (components)

e. If there is an assistance component, briefly describe

6. Performance Evaluation and Alternative Forms of Financial Remuneration

a. Is a career ladder, merit pay, or mentor teacher program operating in your state? If so, briefly describe its goals, whether it is voluntary for teachers and/or districts, whether it is in the pilot stages and how it works

b. Briefly describe whether it operates in addition to or in place of another performance evaluation for all veteran teachers

7. Are state-developed systems for veteran teacher performance evaluation used in conjunction with district systems? If so, how are they different?

8. Please update/correct the following information obtained from a literature review about veteran teacher performance evaluation in your state

9. If your state has developed a veteran teacher performance evaluation system, PLEASE SEND A COPY OF THE INSTRUMENTS AND ANY LITERATURE DESCRIBING THE PROCEDURES along with the completed questions to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

References identified with an EJ or ED number have been abstracted and are in the ERIC database. Journal articles (EJ) should be available at most research libraries; documents (ED) are available in ERIC microfiche collections at more than 700 locations. Documents can also be ordered through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service: (800) 443-ERIC. For more information, contact the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186; (202) 293-2450; (800) 822-9229.

Alabama State Department of Education. (1992). *Signed observation structure-pilot. Abbreviated instructions. General procedures (draft)*. Montgomery: Author.

Barth, R. S. (forthcoming). Reflections on a conversation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 7*(3).

Beckham, J. C. (1981). *Legal aspects of teacher evaluation*. Topeka, KS: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education. ED 207126

Berry, B., & Ginsberg, R. (1989). Legitimizing subjectivity: Meritorious performance and the professionalization of teacher and principal evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 2*, 123-140.

Blase, J., & Kirby, P. C. (1991, December). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press. ED 341165

Boles, K., & Troen, V. (1994, April). *Teacher leadership in a professional development school*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Bransford, J. (1984). Schema activation and schema acquisition: Comments on Richard C. Anderson's remarks. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborne, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), *Learning to read in American schools: Basal readers and content texts* (pp. 259-272). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bray, J. L., Flakus-Mosqueda, P., Palaich, R. M., & Wilkins, J. S. (1985). *New directions for state teacher policies*. (No. TR-85-1). Denver: Education Commission of the States. ED 306202

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching As a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. The report of the Task Force on Teaching As a Profession*. New York: Carnegie Corporation. ED 268120

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1990). *The condition of teaching. Astate-by-state analysis, 1990. A technical report*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press. ED 326528

Choy, S. P., Bobbitt, S. A., Henke, R. R., Medrich, E. A., Horn, L. J., & Lieberman, J. (1993). *America's teachers: Profile of a profession*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. ED 359185

Choy, S. P., Henke, R. R., Alt, M. N., Medrich, E. A., & Bobbitt, S. A. (1993). *Schools and staffing in the United States: A statistical profile*. Washington, DC:

National Center for Education Satistics, U.S. Department of Education. ED 360378

Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought proceses. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 255-295). New York: Macmillan.

Conley, S. C., Bacharach, S. B., & Bauer, S. (1989). The school work environment and teacher career dissatisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 25*(1), 58-81. EJ387089

Connecticut State Department of Education. (1993). *Professional Educator Development (PED) program. Questions and answers (draft)*. Hartford: Author.

Corcoran, T. B. (1990). Schoolwork: Perspectives on workplace reform in public schools. In M. W. McLaughlin, J. E. Talbert, & N. Bascia (Eds.), *The contexts of teaching in secondary schools. Teachers' realities* (pp. 142-166). New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). *Beyond the commission reports. The coming crisis in teaching*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. ED 248245

Darling-Hammond, L. (1986). A proposal for evaluation in the teaching profession. *Elementary School Journal, 86*(4), 531-551. EJ 337997

Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (1988). *The evolution of teacher policy*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, Center for Policy Research in Education. ED 298599

Darling-Hammond, L., with Sclan, E. (1992). Policy and supervision. In C. D. Glickman (Ed.), *Supervision in transition: 1992 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development* (pp. 7-29). Alexandria, VA: ASCD. See ED 344277

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 53*(3), 285-328. EJ 290819

Dewey, J. (1928). Progressive education and the science of education. *Progressive Education, 5*, 197-204.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Duke, D. L. (1993, May). Removing barriers to professional growth. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*(9), 702-704, 710-712. EJ 463873

Eisner, E. W. (1992). Educational reform and the ecology of schooling. *Teachers College Record, 93*(4), 610-627. EJ 450826

Elmore, R. F. (1983). Complexity and control. What legislatures and administrators can do about implementing public policy. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching and policy* (pp. 342-369). New York: Longman.

Flakus-Mosqueda, P. (1986). Teacher testing and performance standards: A survey of selected state policies. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 13*(3), 8-27. EJ 344630

Florida State Department of Education. (1992a). *Domains. Knowledge base of the Florida Performance Measurement System*. Tallahassee: Author.

Florida State Department of Education. (1992b). *Florida Performance Measurement System. Manual for coding teacher performance on the screening summative observation instrument*. Tallahassee: Author.

French, R. L., Holdzkom, D., & Kuligowski, B. (1990, April). *Teacher evaluation in SREB states. Stage I: Analysis and comparison of evaluation systems.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Fullan, M. G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press. ED 354588

Gardner, D. L. (forthcoming). Assessment systems in Florida designed to link teacher performance assessment, professional development, and school improvement. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 7*(3).

Gersten, R., Carnine, D., Zoref, L., & Cronin, D. (1986). A multifaceted study of change in seven inner-city schools. *Elementary School Journal, 86*(3), 257-276. EJ 337872

Glidewell, J. C., Tucker, S., Todt, M., & Cox, S. (1983). Professional support systems: The teaching profession. In A. Nadler, J. D. Fisher, & B. M. DePaulo (Eds.), *New directions in helping* (Vol. 3) (pp. 189-212). New York: Academic Press.

Goldman, J. J. (1983). The supervisor's beliefs about people and the supervisory plan: McGregor's "Theory X" and "Theory Y" in the schools. *ClearingHouse, 56*(7), 306-309. EJ 276225

Good, T. L., & Mulryan, C. (1990). Teacher ratings: A call for teacher control and self-evaluation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation. Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers* (pp. 191-228). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school. Prospects for the future.* New York: McGraw-Hill. ED 236137

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. G. (1992). *Understanding teacher development.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: Author. ED 270454

Illinois State Board of Education. (1989, Winter). *Illinois State Board of Education evaluation plan for teachers, school service personnel, and administrators.* Springfield: Author.

Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). *Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools.* Scranton, PA: Harper Collins Publishers. ED 336387

Knapp, M .S. (1982, March). *Toward the study of teacher evaluation as an organizational process: A review of current research and practice.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1988). *Building a professional culture in schools.* New York: Teachers College Press. ED 300877

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1990). *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now.* Bristol, PA: Falmer Press. ED 333064

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). *Teachers, their world, and their work.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lieberman, A., & Rosenholtz, S. (1987). The road to school improvement: Barriers and bridges. In J. I. Goodlad (Ed.), *The ecology of school renewal: Eighty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 79-98). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ED 305742

Little, J. W., & McLaughlin, M. W. (Eds.). (1993). *Teachers' work. Individuals, colleagues, and contexts*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Louis, K. S., & Miles, M. B. (1990). *Improving the urban high school: What works and why.* New York: Teachers College Press. ED 327623

Macmillan, C. J. B., & Pendlebury, S. (1985). The Florida Performance Measurement System: A consideration. *Teachers College Record, 87*(1), 67-78. EJ 324596

McCarthey, S. J., & Peterson, K. D. (1988). Peer review of materials in public school teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1*, 259-267.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Pfeifer, R. S. (1988). *Teacher evaluation. Improvement, accountability, and effective learning*. New York: Teachers College Press. ED 291727

Murnane, R. J., Singer, J. D., Willett, J. B., Kemple, J. J., & Olsen, R. J. (1991). *Who will teach?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of leadership preparation. Reframing the education of school administrators*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press. ED 352703

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1989). *Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession*. Washington, DC: Author. See ED 337440

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. An open letter to the American people. A report to the nation and the secretary of education*. Washington, DC: Author. ED 226006

Natriello, G. (1990). Intended and unintended consequences: Purposes and effects of teacher evaluation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation. Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers* (pp.35-45). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Natriello, G., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1980). Pitfalls in the evaluation of teachers by principals. *Administrator's Notebook, 29*(6), 1-4. EJ 261536

Peterson, P. L., & Comeaux, M. A. (1990, Spring). Evaluating the systems: Teachers' perspectives on teacher evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12*(1), 3-24. EJ 414307

Raudenbush, S. W., Rowan, B., & Cheong, Y. F. (1992, April). Contextual effects on the self-perceived efficacy of high school teachers. *Sociology of Education, 65*(2),150-167. EJ 455102

Rebell, M. A. (1990). Legal issues concerning teacher evaluation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation. Assessing elementary and secondaryschool teachers* (pp. 337-355). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Regan, H. B., Anctil, M., Dubea, C., Hofmann, J. M., & Vaillancourt, R. (1992). *Teacher. A new definition and model for development and evaluation.* Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Reyes, P. (1990). Organizational commitment of teachers. In P. Reyes (Ed.), *Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance, and productivity* (pp. 143-163). Newbury Park, CA: Sage/Corwin Press. ED 329533

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1985a, May). Effective schools: Interpreting the evidence. *American Journal of Education, 93*(3), 352-388. EJ 319415

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1985b, January). Political myths about education reform: Lessons from research on teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan, 66*(5), 349-355. EJ 311709

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1987). Education reform strategies: Will they increase teacher commitment? *American Journal of Education, 95*(4), 534-562. EJ 360199

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). *Teachers' workplace. The social organization of schools.* New York: Longman.

Rowan, B. (1990). Commitment and control: Alternative strategies for the organizational design of schools. In C. Cazden (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 16) (pp. 353-389). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Sclan, E. M. (1993). The effect of perceived workplace conditions on beginning teachers' work commitment, career choice commitment, and planned retention. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54*-08A. (University Microfilms No. 9400594)

Sclan, E. M., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). *Beginning teacher performance evaluation: An overview of state policies.* Trends and Issues Paper No. 7. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. ED 341689

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1989). Science and scientism in supervision and teaching. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 4*(2), 93-105. EJ 383810

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon. See ED 283275

Shanker, A. (1985). The making of a profession. *American Educator: The Professional Journal of the American Federation of Teachers, 9*(3), 10-17, 46, 48. EJ 324717

Shavelson, R., & Dempsey, N. (1976). Generalizability of measures of teacher behavior. *Review of Educational Research, 46*(4), 553-611. EJ 157785

Shulman, L. S. (1983). Autonomy and obligation. The remote control of teaching. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching policy* (pp. 484-504). New York: Longman.

Shymansky, J. A., & Penick, J. E. (1981). Teacher behavior does make a difference in hands-on science classrooms. *School Science and Mathematics, 81*(5), 412-422. EJ 246279

Slattery, P., & Hall, G. (1988). *Models of teacher evaluation. Policy Bulletin No. 2.* Bloomington, IN: Consortium on Educational Policy Studies. ED 297456

Stodolsky, S. S. (1984). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. *Educational Researcher, 13*(9), 11-18. EJ 309391

Texas Education Agency. (1990). *Texas Teacher Appraisal System, Appraiser/ teacher manual.* Austin: Author.

Tyson-Bernstein, H. (1987). The Texas Teacher Appraisal System: What does it really appraise? *American Educator, 11*(1), 26-31. EJ 351825

Valentine, J. (1990, April). *A national survey of state teacher evaluation policies.* Unpublished research paper, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Bernstein, H. T. (1985). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. *Elementary School Journal, 86*(1), 61-121. EJ 324222

Zumwalt, K. K. (Ed.). (1986). *Improving teaching. 1986 ASCD yearbook.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. ED 267041